

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patcht and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1850 Alexandrid, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,099	01/04/2000	FREDERICK S. DUNLAP	P04056	8711
34456 7	590 08/31/2005		EXAMINER	
1 0 2 3 1 0 0 -	ARSON & ABEL L.L.I ON THE LAKE STE 265	· -		
AUSTIN, TX 78746			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/477,099	DUNLAP ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jacob F. Betit	2164	

Advisory Action	09/477,099	DUNLAP ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacob F. Betit	2164	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the continued for the mailing of the period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the continued for the mailing of the continued for the mailing of the continued for th	n the same day as filing a Notice of owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The replace of the final rejection.	f Appeal. To avoid ab ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C ly must be filed within	ence, which CFR 41.31; or one of the
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on 12 May 2005. A brief date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl AMENDMENTS 	any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3	37(e)), to avoid dismis	ssal of the
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co			pecause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beauting appeal; and/or 	• •	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		jected claims.	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:			
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).	
		SAM RII PRIMARY EX	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: By combining claim 1 with claim 10 and combining claim 11 with claim 20, the claims which depend from claims 1 and 11 require new consideration because during examination the examiner did not consider the case where these dependent claims are dependent from claims 10 and 20 instead of claims 1 and 10. Further by adding new claims 23-26 the applicant is making new limitations that require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: All of the arguments made in the remarks made after the final office action were addressed in the final office action (as indicated below).

The applicant's arguments that "Shimazu fails to disclose or suggest that the transistor ... is selectively connected to one of the outputs of the inverters", the arguments were addressed on page 8, lines 5-12 of the final office action.

The applicant's arguments that "Shimazu provides no disclosure or suggestion that the transistor ... is connected to the output of the inverter by a programmable connect", the arguments were addressed on page 8, lines 14-21 of the final office action.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Matsumura and Shimazu as proposed", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because page 6, line 18 through page 7, line 3 provides this motivation.

Continuation of 13. Other: This is a supplemental advisory action being mailed in response to the applicant's petition to the director and is deemed to further clarify why the amendment after the final office action was not entered by the examiner.